

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 213. Vol. 18.]

LONDON, MAY, 1922.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

A UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR ON MARX.

A Review of "The Revival of Marxism," by J. Shield Nicholson, Sc.D., L.L.D., Professor of Political Economy in the University of Edinburgh. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street, W. 1920.

In his 140 pages of ambiguous University jargon, Professor Nicholson pretends to deal with most of the socialist principles. His so-called arguments are not by any means new, and in some respects are quite inferior to those of the poorly-paid orators of the anti-socialist union and the property defence leagues. It is necessary, however, to examine the more important—if it is possible to choose anything that is important from a mass of quibbles and trivialities.

"The Materialist Conception of History" is one of the first principles which this professor attacks. Twice he attempts to destroy it. The first time, on page 8, he merely strengthens it by his admissions. He says:—

"Any manifestation of idealism at present seems to be associated with internationalism. Not that the internationalism that is now fashionable is free from the materialistic taint. On the contrary, it is mainly concerned with the restoration of trade and of sound monetary conditions."

On page 119 a second attempt is made on the materialist conception of history in the following words:—

"Material fatalism of this kind is the suicide of reason—the deletion from humanity of its vital character."

"The history of progress—economic, as well as of other forms of progress—is the history of the conflict of great ideas. Moral progress is the history of the conflict of great ideals. Material fatalism of this kind is a reversion to intellectual and moral barbarism."

If Professor Nicholson were to enumerate

some of his great ideas it would be possible to show him their obvious connection with economic conditions. If he told us of some of the great ideals that were in conflict in the moral sphere, we might easily point to their connection with material factors. He does neither of these things, nor does he attempt to show how ideas or ideals can exist apart from a materialistic basis. To put forward an opinion which is not substantiated in any way is one of the methods Professor Nicholson employs to shuffle out of the conflict he himself raises, but is neither criticism nor analysis.

On the "Marxian Theory of Value" Professor Nicholson is particularly illuminating. On page 26 he says:—

"The Marxian theory of value was soon shattered by destructive criticism. It is absurd to suppose that Marx discovered certain ideas of value which were neglected by subsequent economists."

"It is still more absurd to suppose that economists wilfully suppressed the teaching of Marx because they were supporters of Capital against Labour. From J. S. Mill onwards, the bias, if there has been any bias, has been the other way."

Then in a footnote the Professor says:—

"Marshall shows that Ricardo and the eminent Ricardian economists were not opposed to the Factory Acts. Even Senior repented his first hasty disapproval."

The average man will confess a difficulty in seeing the connection between Senior's repentance and the Marxian theory of value; yet Nicholson never gets much closer than this to the theory he promises to explode. Statements like the above and abusive remarks about the conceit of Marx make up quite a large portion of his work.

Another charge that Nicholson makes against Marx is, that his reasoning is involved, contradictory, and difficult to understand. Let the reader examine the following from the Professor's work and then try and find something in the works of Marx to equal it:—

"To measure the values of things in terms of labour would obviously be impossible unless we can reduce all the kinds of labour to one common kind. This leads up to the idea of 'socially necessary labour,' which is quite unintelligible unless expressed in unreal hypothesis." (Page 75.)

How that which is "unintelligible" can become intelligible when expressed in "unreal hypothesis" the professor does not say. He missed a golden opportunity by failing to expose either the unreality or the fallacy of "socially necessary labour." He does not do this, no doubt because directly anyone examines the idea of either "socially necessary labour" or the "reduction of all kinds of labour to one common kind" they are so clear and their applicability so apparent, that one stated it would puzzle even a University professor to controvert them.

Here is another example of Nicholson's method. He says:—

"But labour with Marx is not only the real measure, but the real determinant of value.

"If, however, labour as the real measure of value is absurd, labour as the sole real determinant of value is still more absurd."

It will be noticed that there is no attempt here, either at analysis or argument. Neither here, nor anywhere else in the book, does Nicholson show that the amount of socially necessary labour contained in a commodity does not determine its value. When he attempts to do so there is no "if" about his absurdity. He says:—

"The exchange values of things, whether we take long periods or short periods, depend on a variety of equal causes, and any change in one or more of them will bring about a change in the resultant value of the thing.

"Among these causes is the amount of labour required to produce the thing.

"In general, in any product, there are very different qualities of labour concerned.

"And not only is labour required, but all sorts of auxiliary capital."

As can be seen at a glance, labour of different qualities can be reduced to labour of the simplest kind merely by comparison. If, for instance, a commodity were produced solely by two men, the labour-power of the one being paid for at the rate of two shillings per hour and the other at one shilling

per hour, and if the two men each worked on the commodity two hours, the amount of labour-power contained could either be reckoned as two hours of skilled plus two hours simple labour or as six hours of simple labour. The wages paid, six shillings, would be the same either way. Marx contends that this is done whenever the prices of commodities are compared, no matter how diverse the qualities of the labour-power embodied in them. As Nicholson shirks this question, although referring to it in passing, it must be taken for granted that he could find no fault with it.

Next among the variety of real causes is "all sorts of auxiliary capital." But whether capital is auxiliary or principal, it is capital just the same—that is, wealth used for exploitation. Thus of all the "variety of real causes on which exchange value depends," according to Nicholson, only two can be shown, i.e., different kinds of capital and different kinds of labour, or at bottom simply capital and labour. As capital, in whatever form it appears, is wealth, it follows that it must have been produced by the application of human energy to the nature-given material. Professor Nicholson's enumeration of his variety of real causes, when advanced this one logical step further, lands him in the same boat with Marx. He knows that every intelligent reader will see this, so he promises to show the absurdity of it in his next chapter on the accumulation of capital and in the chapter on profits. In the first of these chapters he argues that capitalism is not all a black record of evil. "On the contrary," he says, "the growth of capitalism through the ages has also been one of the agents in the general advance of civilisation." Obviously, this does not disprove the statement that "capital in all its forms is congealed or crystallised labour." Neither does it prove anything to the credit of capitalism. War is one of the agents in the general advance of civilisation, yet the sooner it is abolished the better for the human race.

The only thing in the chapter on accumulation of capital that can be construed into having any connection with capital as "congealed or crystallised labour" is the following quotation and certain deductions made by the professor:—

"The conditions of production are also those of reproduction. No society can go on producing; in

other words, no society can reproduce, unless it constantly reconverts a part of its products into means of production. . . . Hence a definite portion of each year's product belongs to the domain of production. Destined for productive consumption from the very first, this portion exists, for the most part, in the shape of articles totally unfitted for individual consumption." Capital, vol. I., page 578.

Professor Nicholson comments on this as follows :—

"Labour power must be devoted to the continuous upkeep of the means of production, if the flow of consumable goods is to be continually forthcoming."

He then goes on to argue that there must be changes in the forms and amounts of "productive capital" just as in the forms of "productive labour" if we are to have improvement in the quality of things and continuous substitution of new forms of wealth for old, and then he says :—

"Many passages might be quoted from Marx in which he assents to these general propositions regarding the connection of labour and capital."

With real cunning, however, Nicholson neglects to quote the short passage immediately following the previous quotation, which reads as follows :—

"If production be capitalistic in form, so, too, will be reproduction. Just as in the former the labour-process figures, but as a means towards the self-expansion of capital; so in the latter, it figures, but as a means of reproducing as capital—i.e., as self-expanding value—the value advanced. It is only because his money constantly functions as capital that the economical guise of a capitalist attaches to a man."

Thus, an attempt to use short passages from Marx to justify capitalist methods, or institutions, is frustrated at once by anyone who refers to "Das Capital," and reads the passage together with its context.

In his chapter on profits, Nicholson, instead of exploding Marxian fallacies, as he promised, engages in a somewhat dreary discourse on the false economy of low wages, saying :—

"Everyone can see that a certain minimum must go to labour if its mass and its efficiency is to be kept up. If not, the labour will emigrate or die out."

And, of course, capital must have its maximum, or that too will emigrate, from which Nicholson argues that :

"Insurance against risk is the second element in the usual analysis of gross profits."

A principle which is developed to such an extent that the bulk of capitalist con-

cerns run little or no risk of failure, and can no longer be described as enterprises.

Throughout the book Professor Nicholson drearily complains that Marx, in his analysis, takes no account of demand. Following in the path of Jevons and Hobson, he holds that supply and demand, marginal utility, etc., are the main factors in prices. Although he pretends to have read the works of Marx, and frequently quotes from them, he purposely shuns those portions where Marx explains, in scientific fashion, the real part played by supply and demand in causing temporary fluctuations in price.

The general attitude of Professor Nicholson throughout the book might be summed up in the following paragraph, written by himself and appearing on page 131 :—

"In the complications of modern industry the right of each to the product of his own labour takes the form of the right to the share he can bargain for with the other contributors. He may make his bargain collectively or individually, but the general rule is that the greater the gain the greater the exertion."

In other words, those who work the hardest get the most. No wonder that Marx wrote :—

"Once for all I may here state, that by classical political economy, I understand that economy which, since the time of W. Petty, has investigated the real relations of production in bourgeois society, in contradistinction to vulgar economy, which deals with appearances only, ruminates without ceasing on the materials long since provided by scientific economy, and there seeks plausible explanations of the most obtrusive phenomena, for bourgeois daily use; but for the rest, confines itself to systematising in a pedantic way, and proclaiming for everlasting truths, the trite ideas held by the self-complacent bourgeoisie with regard to their own world, to them the best of all possible worlds."

Which sums up, in a single sentence, not only Professor Nicholson but Jevons, Hobson, Marshall, and all the crowd of professional sycophants who prostitute themselves for wealth and position because truth and science does not pay in the sphere of politics.

F. F.

AN ECONOMIC CLASS

will be held by

BATTERSEA BRANCH, S.P.G.B.

at

18, Creek Street, York Road, Battersea,

EVERY MONDAY EVENING at 7.30 p.m.

Commencing Monday, 3rd April, 1922.

"A WORLD COMMONWEALTH."

To the organised workers of the world remains the ultimate task of establishing the greatest of all systems of society. It is the supreme purpose, and can be stated thus: taking the two essential factors—the world and its inhabitants—to realise to the fullest the means of the well-being and happiness of the whole of humanity.

The history of the ages can be depicted as a series of connected social systems evolving one from another, in each of which the mode of wealth-production is the chief consideration determining the character and structure of that system.

Man needs food, clothing, and shelter. All are derived from the planet on which he lives by the application of labour-power usefully exercised. Without these things he perishes; if insufficiently obtained, he suffers. Without labour they are unobtainable. They minister to his physical and mental needs. Man has a many-sided, complex nature. The more highly developed society becomes, the greater the need for the co-operative efforts of the units composing it.

Man can only develop his finest social instincts, his best physical and mental qualities, in a society whose members are free. Otherwise those potentialities, both in society and its units, are thwarted or stunted. Man's chief usefulness is in contributing to the social wealth.

In the broadest sense, all that ministers to humanity's physical and mental needs, advantages, and enjoyments, can be considered as social wealth.

But to-day we find that society is, roughly, divided into two classes with *conflicting interests*. This has been brought about through the historic development since primitive times. It arises from the fact that the ownership and control of the *means of living* are in the hands of one class. Wealth is socially produced, but the wealth itself is privately owned and controlled by the capitalist class.

The much larger class in society—the working class—does not own nor control the means of living. The function it fulfils is to act as wealth-producer for the class that owns. The workers own nothing but their potential energy of brain and hand: and, through their efforts, alone, all wealth is produced.

The master class do nothing useful whatsoever in the process of wealth production.

The working class thus exist under the present system in a *state of slavery*. Theirs to produce commodities for sale in the market. They are "wage-slaves," who receive in "wages" but a small portion of the values they produce—on the average but a bare subsistence wage. The surplus-value they produce in factory or workshop is only realised for the capitalist by sale in the market. It is represented by Rent, Interest, and Profit.

Being used to produce surplus-value, the working class are thus exploited and robbed of the product of their toil. The result to the workers is seen in their chronic poverty and misery, unemployment, disease, overwork, and a host of evils inevitably springing from the system itself—the result of production for "profit" for the benefit of a class. But to that class who exploit them it means an ever-increasing affluence, luxury, and idleness.

Now the main reason why the capitalist class are thus able to own and control the very lives of the workers is because they are in possession of *political power*, and use it for their class-interests alone.

The solution, then, is obvious! When once the workers of the world become conscious of their slavery, they will *organise as a class* to capture the powers of Government in order to emancipate themselves. Once in possession of that, and its adjuncts—the armed forces—they will use it as a means of establishing an entirely new system of society—*Socialism*. Under their administration all the means of wealth production and distribution will be owned and controlled by the whole community—wealth being produced then for the use and enjoyment of all!

The class-division will thus be automatically abolished, as the essential interests of all its members are one and the same. Thus, and thus only, will be assured the *means* for the well-being and happiness of the members of society as a whole; and the evils of wage-slavery will be ended with their root cause—Capitalism. So we see that the realisation of the greatest social system depends on the organised efforts of a class-conscious, determined *working class*. Theirs to free themselves and secure the means of comfort, equality, and freedom for all.

Hence the clarion call of Karl Marx: "Wage-workers of all countries, unite! You have nought to lose but your chains; you have a world to win!" J. G. M.

"THE FUTURE OF INDUSTRY."

In the "Glasgow Herald" (January 25th, 1922) appeared an article with the above title, reporting a speech by the Lord Advocate of Scotland addressed to the Reading Circle of Palmerston Place United Free Church, Edinburgh. The title is one which can be found heading many of the speeches and writings of members of the master class and their satellites.

In his speech the Lord Advocate states:—

"To-day, millions of unemployed had the right to ask by what road had they reached the present pass."

To whom does the Lord Advocate refer the unemployed millions for answer to this question? He does not say. The best individual the worker can put that question to is himself, but somewhat in the following manner: Why are there two opposing classes in present-day society, working class and master class, whose interests clash very bitterly?

Suppose a worker asks the question that the Lord Advocate states he has a right to do, and the questioner goes to a capitalist or his agent, he will be given quite a number of alleged reasons. The main reason that is put forward by the masters at the moment is that the War is the cause of the trouble, and that to put matters right capital and labour must come together to work with a spirit of goodwill, and that all the suspicion and distrust that exists between them must be dropped. This point of view was put forward by Mr. Vernon Hartshorn in the House of Commons on April 5th, 1921.

"I want to say that in my opinion the first essential to that end is for the Government to act in relation to this problem in such a manner as to eradicate from the minds of the miners what has become a deep-rooted conviction, namely, that the Government are in league with the owners to thwart the ambitions and the aspirations of the miners, and to side with the employers; rightly or wrongly, that conviction is deep-rooted in the minds of the miners." (Par., Debates No. 32, Vol. 140.)

In these few words it is not difficult for one to read what is evidently intended—that the existing conflict which is being perpetually waged must be smothered by

some means. This particular working-class misleader was not prepared to openly attack the masters, who were supported by the Government, as witness the following:—

"We think the time has now come when a proper relationship should be re-established between the owners and the workmen."

A quotation from another misleader will be informing in this connection. The following is a statement by Mr. Brace in the House of Commons on October 19th, 1920:—

"It would not be helpful to the welfare of the State to have a fight to the finish; neither would it be so for the Federation, or for the Government. I say quite frankly that if the State has made up its mind, its resources are sufficient to defeat the Miners' Federation. Suppose you drive the Miners' Federation back to a defeated people, a disgruntled, soured and bitter people, what then becomes of the output? It is output you want. Unless we get a greater output the supremacy of this nation, as a first-class commercial and industrial power, must disappear. Therefore, let us get into an atmosphere of not desiring either to defeat the Government or to humble a great organisation like the Miners' Federation. . . . Therefore we make affirmation, that it is our belief that a larger output is essential to the well-being of the country; we also declare that the output can be maintained by mutual goodwill between owners and workmen. . . . We would agree to the setting up of National and District Committees in order to obtain increased output. What does that mean? It means that the Miners' Federation of Great Britain, as an organisation, would agree to make it their hourly, daily, and weekly business by way of co-operation to produce coal." (Par., Debates No. 120, Vol. 133.)

It is evident that, should a member of the working class approach one of these agents of capitalism, he would not receive a clear explanation of the cause of, and remedy for, the industrial troubles. These people are clearly concerned with enjoining the worker to produce more, and, according to Mr. Brace, the miners must work with the mineowners with this particular object in view.

It is only from the Socialist that a correct explanation of the cause of the evils of Capitalism can be obtained. If the reader will turn to the Declaration of Principles printed on the back page of this paper the cause of, and remedy for, working-class poverty and misery will be found briefly set forth.

If workers will give the matter a little examination, they will realise that they, as a class, are quite propertyless; that those who own the mines, mills, and so forth do not work in them; that all the wealth pro-

duced is the result of the application, by the working class, of their energies to the nature-given material.

Now, Fellow-Worker, it is your class who performs the task of wealth production in modern society. When that is done, do you and your mates own the wealth which you collectively have produced? Of course not; but why not? Because the capitalists, owning the means of production, are enabled to take from you the wealth you produce. You have no other way of gaining access to the means of life except by working for the capitalist.

It must be borne in mind that the masters do not give the workers permission to work out of love or fellow-feeling. Workers are engaged in the production of food, clothing, and shelter, not because the community require these things, but in order that the owners of these things shall obtain a profit. Profit is what the masters want, and it does not matter to them how sorely people may be in need, there will be no production unless there is profit to be obtained.

Consequently the future of industry under Capitalism will mean increased profit to the capitalist and increased toil and misery to the workers.

W. E. B.

UNDER THE IRON HEEL.

During the Big War, on one occasion when a crowd was dispersed in Turin for demanding bread, by the simple expedient of dropping bombs on them from airplanes, the present writer gave it as his opinion that this method would be resorted to in future disputes between the oppressors and the oppressed, and that this occasion marked its introduction as a permanent feature under capitalism. Events since then have fully born out that statement.

Wherever we turn—India, Egypt, Africa, in fact, any place where "rebellion" is in progress—there you will find this latest instrument of slaughter freely used. So far, this method has not been employed in this country, but it is not too much to say that if the capitalist class take it into their heads that this method is the best and most effective for producing "order," its introduction will not be long delayed. A few mass meetings of the out-of-works and strikers, and the unemployment problem would be solved!

Its use on the Rand, where hundreds of

Trade Unionists were in the midst of a trade dispute which had developed into a test of violence, is sufficiently recent to be remembered.

However justifiably workers may have acted in taking any particular line, the point to be remembered is that the master class is determined to smash up such efforts, and will not scruple to use any means to effect that end.

The writer has been asked his opinion regarding the scenes depicted in the novel by Upton Sinclair, "King Coal," as to whether they were, or were not, exaggerated. Readers of that book will remember that Mr. Sinclair describes the system supposed to be in operation in the mining districts of the Western States, where hired thugs, spies, and other evils are employed by the capitalists against the workers. I gave it as my opinion that these evils were in no way exaggerated, and recent reports from the States confirm the correctness of that opinion.

The mine owners in West Virginia seem determined to stamp out the movement for organising the workers into the United Mine Workers' Union. More than 45,000 miners are already enrolled in this Union, and the organisers were determined to get another 45,000 non-unionists in. These are mostly located in the Logan and Mingo counties, where, it seems, the mine owners are in complete command of the county administration, with the sheriffs also in their pay. As most of the houses tenanted by the miners are owned by the companies, naturally the first thing the latter did was to threaten with eviction every man joining the Union.

This they did, utilising for the purpose detectives of the Baldwin-Felt Agency, who are notorious gunmen. Fights were the result, with loss of life on both sides. On one occasion, during a march of Union men, they were met by troops and mine guards, which resulted in a battle in the mountains lasting for days.

Whenever things are not lively enough for the gunmen, they proceed to "shoot up" a town or two in order to strike terror into the hearts of the miners and their families. The State Attorney-General himself admits that the mine owners hold the entire machinery of administration in their grip, so that the miners in their quest for "justice" find themselves "up against it"

at every turn. The latest reports show that efforts are being made to have the United Mine Workers declared an illegal association! ("Manchester Guardian," 28/10/21.)

Another account, taken from the "Toiler" (New York), says:—

"The mines, stores, churches, schools, hospitals, homes, Press, and the entire governmental machinery are owned outright by the coal barons. The salaries of deputy sheriffs are paid by the operators, and the State Constabulary is picked from lists prepared by them. All the mining area is under the domination of the Baldwin-Felt Detective Agency's gunmen and murderers. These armed guards watch the pay rolls, collect rents, evict workers, run miners out of town, and serve as general thugs and hangmen for the capitalists. The workers are robbed going and coming. . . any defiance of this system of slavery, any sign of workers' resistance, is met with club, bayonet, and machine-gun. . . Finally, Harding was appealed to for a conference. In reply to this appeal came Federal troops, aeroplanes, gas bombs, and machine-guns to crush the workers." (Quoted from the *Worker*, Brisbane, 2/2/22.)

Very similar to this was the way in which the workers were treated during the recent strike in the San Joaquin oilfields of California. After striking against the reduction of a dollar a day and the abolition of the Arbitration Board, they found themselves up against a very formidable and well-organised resistance. The strikers themselves formed a body of pickets, whose business it was to see that no strike breakers were brought into the district, and at the same time to prevent any disorder taking place, so that a straight fight on principle could be waged. This, however, was futile. Guards were rushed in and the Press made the most of the affair—in the interests of the bosses, of course. Like the West Virginia coal owners, the oil companies had their hired thugs and spies, who conducted their operations clandestinely. Appeals to the Government were useless, and the strikers soon found themselves down and out, with the result that the strike collapsed and the men decided to return to work without having secured any advantage. When they offered to return, however, they were informed that they were not needed. It was then discovered that a very elaborate system of blacklisting had been prepared during their absence. Each company apparently possessed full particulars of every applicant for work, and on every occasion he was turned away. This soon had the effect of creating a large body of moneyless, jobless men. To make matters worse, the strikers soon

discovered that the names on the black list had been circulated by the companies among the traders of the town, so that it was an impossibility to obtain credit. As in most disputes, the Press endeavoured to show that the trouble was due to the agitation set up by the Bolsheviks, Socialists, and what not. Raids made on the homes of individuals resulted in the finding of quantities of seditious literature, which, as is usual in such cases, had been carefully concealed beforehand by the "finders." These facts I have taken from "The Golden Age," Brooklyn, N.Y. (15/2/22).

Altogether, what has been reported lately from the various industrial centres of America leads me to believe that what Sinclair said was rather under-estimated, if anything.

One needn't be surprised, of course, at any of these things. They are not confined to America. The same class is in possession everywhere, and everywhere its methods are the same. It follows that there is only one cure—Socialism.

TOM SALA.

£1,000 FUND.

	£	s.	d.
Already Acknowledged	725	17	9½
Donations:—			
Buckingham, P.		7	6
W. Cross		2	6
Mrs. C. & G.	1	0	0
Islington Branch	1	5	0
"W.H."	1	0	0
"H."	1	0	0
Central Branch	3	0	0
Stamp Books:—			
Hackney Branch, 1		4	0
Tottenham, 10, 11		6	0
Battersea Branch, 23, 5/-; 46, 6/-; 47, 6d.; 48, 16/-	1	7	6
Tooting Branch, 44		3	6
Proceeds from Opera Lecture	1	7	0
Collection at Party Meeting		5	0
Balance for Gramophone		5	0
	£794	12	9½

All comrades and sympathisers with any "loose" to spare should forward same immediately to the Secretary, T.P.F., 17, Mount Pleasant, W.C.1.

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS.

Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra. To be had from S.P.G.B., 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free..	..	3s. 0d.
Six Months, post free	1s. 6d.

The Socialist Standard,

MAY



1922

PSYCHOLOGY AND INDUSTRY.

For the last few years there has been a boom in psychology. Most bookshops exhibit ponderous volumes dealing with this particular subject. Booksellers' lists advertise numerous books setting forth conflicting theories.

As a general rule, when there is a boom in the scientific or pseudo scientific world in any particular subject, a close examination of the matter will disclose some important material interest lying at the back of the boom; or some material interest that is served by assisting to boom whatever matter is in question.

To this general rule psychology is no exception.

A short time ago a little book was published by Methuen & Co., Ltd., entitled "Present-Day Applications of Psychology, with special reference to Industry, Education, and Nervous Breakdown," by Charles S. Myers, M.A., M.D., Sc.D., F.R.S., Director of the Psychological Laboratory, Cambridge.

The author defines Psychology as the scientific study of the human and animal mind. He advocates the appointment of trained Psychologists in all branches of industry as a profitable proposition from a commercial point of view. In order to illustrate how valuable such a proposition would

be to employers he gives a description of certain experiments that have been made.

One such experiment he describes as follows—with reference to the principle of the number of contractions that could be carried out in lifting weights before exhaustion ensues:—

"This principle has been applied practically in the case of 500 shovellers who were being employed in shovelling, with a shovel of constant size, material of very varying weight—sometimes coal, sometimes ashes, at other times heavy iron ore, etc., etc. Experiments were conducted with shovels of different sizes in order to ascertain the optimal weight per shovel load of a good shoveller. The best average weight was found to be 21 lbs. Accordingly, shovels were made of different sizes, in proportion to the heaviness of the material shovelled, so that each shovel whether full of coal, ash or iron, etc., weighed 21 lbs. This was the most important innovation, although others were at the same time carried out. The results were as follows:—(i) the average amount shovelled per day rose by nearly 270 per cent—from 16 to 59 tons per man; (ii) 150 men could now perform what 500 men had performed under previous conditions; (iii) the average earnings of the shovellers increased by 60 per cent.; (iv) the cost of the management, after paying all extra expenses, was reduced by 50 per cent.; (v) there was no evidence of increased fatigue of the shovellers." (Page 9—italics ours.)

From the above it will be seen that by applying the results of scientific psychology in this particular case the gain to the capitalist would be 270 per cent. in the amount shovelled, whilst the increase in shovellers' earnings was only 60 per cent., i.e., a nett gain to the capitalist of 210 per cent. Of course, experience tells us that the workers in question would not be long in receipt of the 60 per cent. increase. There is little doubt that in such a case a revision of piece-work rates would soon occur.

On top of the nett gain of 210 per cent. there is a further advantage to the capitalist of 50 per cent. decrease in the cost of management.

The following quotation from the "Daily News" (11/3/22) gives an illustration of the application of scientific psychology in another branch of industry. The quotation refers to the activity of the National Institute of Industrial Psychology:—

"Dr. C. S. Myers, the director of the institute, who stated that he had resigned the chair of psychology at Cambridge University to devote himself to the work of the institute, said that during the year investigators had examined into the methods of packing chocolates for Messrs. J. Lyons & Co. By favouring rhythmical movements and abolishing unnecessary ones, an average increase

of output amounting to 35 per cent. had been obtained." (Italics ours.)

Here again we have the same point illustrated—a gain to the employers.

According to the above two quotations it will be seen that the nett result obtained by the application of scientific psychology to industry may be stated as follows: A larger amount of surplus value will be obtained by the capitalist and there will be less employment to be obtained by the workers. This will be due to the more economical handling of the means of wealth production.

One main point is forced to our notice here. The application of science to industry under capitalism has two general effects: it increases the productiveness of a given quantity of human labour power, thereby increasing the profits of the capitalists, and at the same time increasing the unemployment and consequent misery of the workers.

How topsy-turvy, then, is a system of society in which the valuable productive methods provided by scientific research are of necessity converted into a source of profit for the few and a source of misery for the mass of the population?

The only way to avoid such an anomaly is to substitute for the present form of society another form in which all the means and methods that science can discover to aid in the production of wealth and lessen the toil of the producers will be welcomed by the whole of society as means to obtain increased leisure and enjoyment.

SOCIALISM, "MATTER" AND GHOSTS.

The Editors, SOCIALIST STANDARD.

Dear Sirs,

I regret that Mr. Sala should be under the impression that I think he is an uninformed person. I am quite sure that, where Socialism is concerned, he is not so.

I did think the articles to which I referred in my letter in the "S.S." of February unnecessary, because the ordinary working-man is not distracted from pondering on his economic condition by philosophy or psychical research, nor do these subjects "bluff" him. To him, they are but faint and far-off voices. It would be more to the purpose to attack football, racing, cinemas and beer.

However, if you are going to give us, occasionally, articles on the subjects in

question, for heaven's sake give us something better than piffle. I agree with Mr. Sala that these matters should not be outside our interests.

In the December "S.S." Mr. Sala seemed very cocksure about "matter." My simple questions have dissipated his dogmatism. He now recognises that "matter" *per se* is unthinkable. ("S.S.," February.) I agree. It is merely "a point of view." As Bergson says, "A frozen snapshot of mobility."

I am disappointed that Mr. Sala fights shy of my second question. The fact is, we can think of force alone as the cause of our sensations. Dead, inactive "matter" or "substance," if there were such, we could never, by any possibility, know; since, by the definition, it could never act upon us, and produce sensation. That which acts, of course, is force. We are compelled to think that sensation is evoked by efficient power, which is not still and inert, but is forceful, active and alive. Apart from sensation, thus produced, we have no knowledge of the universe whatsoever.

Berkeley calls this power which effects sensation in us, Spirit; Schopenhauer calls it Will; Spencer calls it Force. But it is manifest to a student of philosophy that these thinkers are referring to one and the same reality—a reality totally different from the naïve, self-contradictory, common-sense illusion of "material substance."

The author of "Ghosts" is, clearly, uninformed on the subject upon which he has the temerity to write. To refer to the findings of men trained in the scientific method as "senility" does not reveal the honest scrutiniser of facts.

Yours fraternally,

GEO. T. FOSTER.

REPLY.

Comrades,

I will deal with Mr. Foster's last point first.

Although, personally, I fully endorse all that the author of "Ghosts" says in his article, yet, as its authorship does not concern me, I can only refer to Mr. Foster's criticism of what appears over my own name.

There are quite a lot of people who think our articles are unnecessary; in fact would like to see them suppressed altogether, for the simple reason that we tell the truth in too straight a fashion. We prostitute

neither our pens nor our intellects. What we have to say is based on a scientific foundation, and is solely in the interests of the working class. It may be true—I hope it is—that “the ordinary (!) working man is not distracted from his economic condition by philosophy or psychical research.” He would be distracted indeed were he to meddle with this stuff. Mr. Foster’s observation that these subjects do not bluff the workers is superfluous. I never said they did. The notion is absurd. But that individuals in the name of Science do bluff the workers needs no proving: it is apparent to any intelligent observer. An instance was the one quoted in the December issue, where the existence of a “Creator” and a “Soul” were implied in a publication claiming to embody the latest scientific discoveries and which was intended for the consumption of the general public.

As sensation is only produced by material objects, and as the terms “God” and “Soul” appear, when tested by the light of science, to be outside the domain of human knowledge, my intellect cannot apprehend them. In my humble way I believed that before we could even think there must be some material to be thought of, that thought itself was a mode of material activity. Mr. Foster calls it being “cocksure” and wants something better than this “piffle.” He states that his “simple” questions have dissipated my dogmatism. If so, he has succeeded in dissipating something which wasn’t there. My criticism was essentially scientific. Science and dogma are incompatible; there is no dogmatic science.

I certainly said that matter *per se* was unthinkable. So it is. One cannot conceive of matter apart from energy. But Mr. Foster’s statement that I “now” recognise this implies that I didn’t know it before. He assumes too much.

It is reported that, according to experiments made by Sir Wm. Ramsay, energy has been transformed into matter, but it is quite positive that without the assistance of material agencies the experiment could not have been made under artificial conditions. Present-day Physics require us to dismiss “matter” in its *ultimate* sense as an obsolete hypothesis, and to replace it by “energy” with its capacity for entering into various combinations.

But what does it mean? Simply this: that what we call “matter” is built up of electrical charges containing vast stores of energy, so that it might appear that matter and energy are really one and the same thing. Reduced to terms of electricity, the question remains—What is electricity? So far science does not profess to know. But Mr. Foster does—it is “merely a point of view”!

Having disposed of matter in this way, he goes on to say that force *alone* is the cause of our sensations. If by “force” Mr. Foster meant “energy,” then I would be with him in his conception of how sensation is evoked. But he appears to rule both matter and energy out altogether. That is why I “fought shy” of his question. As it stood it was simply unintelligible to me. As I pointed out in my last letter, “force” has no physical existence. Apart from that, I may be permitted to point out that we of the Socialist Party fight shy of no proposition or criticism, whether coming from Mr. Foster or anyone else; the only condition being that it is in an understandable form.

For ordinary convenience scientists are obliged to use the term “matter” whatever its “ultimate” nature may be. But Mr. Foster believes there is a “reality” somewhere beyond this: something totally different to the “common-sense illusion of material substance.” If there is something else which is neither matter nor energy and yet is reality, it wants proving. I am afraid that if I, in my present capacity as Extension Lecturer in Geology, were to tell my audiences that the “matter” I was attempting to describe had no real existence, but that what did exist was some indefinable something, totally unrelated to the material substance they only imagined they were conscious of, I should be chased off the premises.

To sum the matter up, what do Mr. Foster’s statements amount to?

Matter has no existence—to say it exists is to be dogmatic. The paper upon which I am writing does not exist—it is purely imagination. What *does* exist is “reality”—but a different reality to the reality which we call matter and which is made apparent to our senses by energy. Berkeley called it Spirit; Schopenhauer called it Will; Spencer called it Force; Mr. Foster calls it Reality; some call it God. But it really

doesn't matter: they all mean the same thing!

To me it appears to be a difference in the methods employed in the interpretation of phenomena—on the one hand the scientific, on the other the one employed by students of bourgeois philosophy.

Under capitalism, the majority of men do not derive their opinions from scientific truth; scientific truth itself is often distorted to accommodate men's opinions. This truckling to ignorance, to which scientists almost without exception lend themselves, reveals their dependence on the vagaries of the ruling class, who are their paymasters, and who, in the last resort, determine what views shall, or shall not, be propagated. At the present time a Bill is before the legislature of Kentucky forbidding the use in schools of text books in which the doctrine of evolution is taught. Under a scientific system of society this would not happen. It is precisely that for which we are working. The present system is completely reactionary so far as the welfare of the majority of mankind is concerned.

They are steeped in ignorance, we know, and it is intended by those in power to keep them there. So far only the Socialists have undertaken the task of enlightening them on their true position in the universe. Those "faint and far off voices" shall be brought nearer, so that the much maligned proletariat can examine their meaning. What there is in science they will, before very long, appropriate, providing it coincides with their interests. There is sufficient already to guide the Socialist on his course of redeeming mankind from the misery and slavery in which it has toiled and existed to this day. It is to a system of freedom based upon the scientific principles enunciated by Karl Marx that we look forward, rather than the "never-ending, eternal weight of glory" of Sir Oliver Lodge. This will be accomplished, not on the lines suggested by Mr. Foster of attacking the evils of a system, but the more scientific method of removing the causes.

I have treated this at some length in order to show Mr. Foster, and others like him, that, as scientific Socialists, we have no use for their metaphysical nonsense, and that, although members of the "ordinary" working class, we are not the "duds" they think we are.

Yours fraternally,

TOM SALA.

CAPITALISM AND CRIME.

If we as workers make a critical analysis of capitalist society, we find that it does not appear to contain many redeeming features. The class in whose interests the present system of society is maintained, care little who is crushed and become its victims, so long as the development assures to them profits and the security of their position as a ruling class.

The fundamental feature of modern society is the private property basis, production and distribution of wealth for profit, and the maintenance of that position by the resort to force.

We have stated that society is based upon private property, *i.e.*, the private ownership of land, raw materials, machinery of production and distribution, by and in the interests of a relatively few people.

The overwhelming majority of the people of each capitalist country are divorced from their means of livelihood, or, in other words, cannot claim a right to the food, clothing, and shelter necessary to sustain life. Although food and clothing exist in abundance, capitalist papers record almost daily either people dying of starvation or millions just obtaining a bare subsistence.

When wealth has been produced in such huge quantities that it chokes the markets of the world, we have the vast majority of the workers suffering most acutely at the very time they should be enjoying life to the full. Even if workers are successful in obtaining employment, the wages they receive in exchange for the expenditure of their labour power is only just sufficient on an average to sustain life and generate enough energy to go on working if profitable to their masters.

The housing accommodation is of the worst, millions existing in wretched hovels or in one or two-roomed tenements. The food they obtain for themselves and dependants is of the poorest, often adulterated to such an extent that it is almost unfit for human consumption. The clothes and boots are usually of the shabbiest and shoddiest kind.

In fact, many thousands of workers go through life, even when in employment, and are never "lucky" enough to put a new suit upon their backs or new boots upon their feet.

But if that can be said with truth of those

employed, what must be the experience of those more frequently unemployed than employed?

Obviously, their conditions must on the whole consist of a far more bitter struggle for existence. If those able-bodied men and women are ready, willing, and prepared to expend their quota of energy in producing the world's wealth for the sustenance and comfort of the human race, and the capitalist class refuse them the opportunity of so doing, then can it be wondered at that many of them are driven to crime?

These victims of capitalist society resort to countless ways to obtain the wherewithal to live.

The vast majority seemingly resign themselves to their wretched existence, easily fall a victim of apathy and despair, usually awaiting death as the only way out of their troubles and anxieties.

But an ever-increasing number, many of whom are exceptionally intelligent men and women, prefer to commit offences against the laws of private property and so to obtain a modicum of comfort or even to live in luxury on a lavish scale. Almost daily we see reported in the Press accounts of daring coups and great robberies running into thousands of pounds of wealth; likewise countless numbers of petty thefts from working-class houses, shops, docks, and railway sidings, etc. It requires but little intelligence for any discerning and enquiring person to see that crimes are the outcome of the ever-worsening struggle for existence.

The latter statement is amply borne out by the following quotations from the "Evening News" (14/2/22).

"Falling prices, the prolonged stagnation of trade, and the money tightness are responsible for the ever-increasing number of fake burglaries and fake fires in London: and the insurance companies are having a by no means happy time."

Writing of the assessors engaged by insurance companies, they say:—

"Theirs is a different profession now-a-days, for assessors are finding that each year thieves are becoming more ingenious and more scientific. The old type of cracksmen is fast disappearing, and the new type is a subtle-minded Raffles rather than primitive Bill Sikes. Among them are ex-officers and educated men who have given up the search for work in favour of an exciting and remunerative life, whereby three or four jobs a year provide them with an excellent income. They dress well, frequent the best hotels and restaurants, often mix in good society, and remain unsuspected by the police unless their crimes are exceptional enough

to attract investigations by Scotland Yard's Special Branch." (Italics mine.)

The capitalist system produces the "criminals" as it produces other social features. If men cannot obtain employment and therefore obtain a means of subsistence, what alternative is there for them but to beg, borrow, or steal, or in the last resort commit suicide? Even in the latter instance if the individual fails to accomplish the desired end—extinction of life—he is hauled before a defender of private property and punished.

The system produces its own "criminals" and then proceeds to punish them. There are generally more workers in the market than actually required by the employers. This fact alone is sufficient evidence that unemployment will continue. With the wonderful improvements in machinery, and scientific applications to industry, the tendency will be in the direction of rendering more and more workers superfluous; this will probably bring a further increase in "crime" against the laws of property. Every year competition in the world of finance and industry becomes more keen, crises occur more rapidly, and bankruptcies stare in the face large numbers of one-time well-established businesses. Just recently in the financial world two very large firms closed their doors, and practically the whole of the staff are cut off for the time from the means of obtaining their livelihood.

A newspaper reporter appeared at the offices of the firms to obtain information of the crash, and he reports as follows:—

"The staff at the City Equitable numbers about 80, and they are still at work at the office. But it was said to-day that all but 6 or 7 would have to be dismissed in a week or two."

At the offices of the other firm only one of the staff was left, and he was alleged to have made the following statement:—

"Many of us had entrusted our savings to the firm, and all of them have gone in the crash. It will be a hard time for us, especially the middle-aged men who have been here for so many years. There seems to be little prospect of our finding other employment." *Evening News*, 17/2/22.

Here is an instance of modern society being responsible for the production of its potential "criminals." If there is little prospect of them obtaining other employment, what can they do to obtain food, clothing, and shelter in the future for themselves and families?

But capitalism allows but little room for

excuses from its victims. If they do not obtain their sustenance by legal means, then they must pay the penalty. Even the most trivial offence against the law is sufficient for the watchdogs of law and order to lay their hands on the offender, as the following will serve to show:—

"Found snaring chaffinches, an ex-service man was charged to-day at Tottenham with cruelty and was fined £5. "I was out of work," he said, "and was chancing my arm." (Italics mine.) *Evening News*, 16/2/22.

On numerous occasions cases have been reported in the Press of proceedings in the police courts against individuals charged with manslaughter, robbery with violence, and murder. It is seldom urged on behalf of the police by counsel conducting the case that the prisoner has destroyed human life or inflicted grievous injury merely as a lust for blood or wanton destruction. As a rule, lurking in the background are the ugly facts of poverty or starvation.

The writer commenced this article by saying that capitalism could hardly claim one solitary redeeming feature. And so he will conclude it. Rack your brain as you will, almost every social evil and disease you can name arises out of and through the maintenance of a system of society wherein the wealth producers, i.e., the working class, are robbed of the wealth they alone produce.

With Socialism established, it will be in the interests of ALL to see that every able-bodied man and woman contributed their quota of energy necessary for production of wealth, and so lighten the task and make possible a happy, contented race of people.

THE SETTLER.

NOW ON SALE.

MANIFESTO

OF

THE SOCIALIST PARTY

OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Sixth Edition—With New Preface.

Price Threepence. Post Free, Fourpence

FROM THE

S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1

DIGHT'S DILEMMA.

To the Editors, SOCIALIST STANDARD.

Dear Sirs,

On page 104 of the SOCIALIST STANDARD of this month's issue you quote from Marx's "Critique of Political Economy," as follows:—

"No social order ever disappears before all the productive forces for which there is room in it have developed; and new higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions for their existence have matured in the womb of the old society."

And then, for the purpose of emphasising the above quotation, you quote again, this time from the "oft-quoted passage" (so gleefully and gloatingly quoted so often by yourselves since the November Revolution in Russia) from the preface to Marx's "Capital":—

"One nation can and should learn from others. And even when a society has got upon the right track for the discovery of the natural laws of its movement—and it is the ultimate aim of this work to lay bare the economic law of motion of modern society—it can neither clear by bold leaps, nor remove by legal enactments, the obstacles offered by the successive phases of its normal development. But it can shorten and lessen the birth pangs." (Italics mine.)

And this is your interpretation as instanced by your comment which follows immediately upon the quotations:—

"These quotations prove not only that Marx did not expect a country in a backward condition economically to be able to establish Socialism, but also that he expressly denied such a thing possible. So far from following Marx as 'Judex' suggests, Lenin has acted in direct opposition to Marx's teaching. To suggest that, a country like Russia, still largely feudalistic, with only the beginnings of capitalism, is 'most suitable for Socialism,' shows a most complete ignorance of Marx, coupled with a boundless recklessness of assertion."

Far from wanting to defend "Judex," of the "English Review," I am nevertheless opposed to the possible inference that can be drawn from the above, that Lenin, as well as "Judex," displays "ignorance of Marx, coupled with a boundless recklessness of assertion," as well as your "reckless assertion" that "Lenin has acted in direct opposition to Marx's teaching." Marx, of course, "did not expect a country in a backward condition economically to establish Socialism." But did Lenin? Again and again did Lenin assert the necessity for the economic development of Russia as being requisite for the establishment of Socialism. But if you wish to imply that

that means that Russia must first of all pass through all the phases of capitalist development, then how do you account for, say, America (among other countries) not having passed through feudalism as well as others that have not passed through all its phases? Marx, when referring to a society being on "the right track for the discovery of the natural laws of its movement," clearly refers to a *revolutionary* period within that society. Hence his reference to the "birth pangs." And then if we read that this revolutionary period cannot be cleared "by bold leaps," nor that "the obstacles offered by the successive phases of its normal development" can be removed "by legal enactments," we shall then be able to reconcile your quotations with the following:—

"Let us now look at Russia. At the time of the Revolution of 1848—1849, the monarchs of Europe, like the European bourgeoisie, saw in Russian intervention their sole means of protection against the proletariat, at that time just awakening to a consciousness of its strength. They placed the Czar at the head of European reaction. To-day, he is a prisoner of revolution at Gatchina, and Russia is in the front rank of the revolutionary movement of Europe. The burden of the Communist manifesto was the declaration of the inevitable disappearance of existing bourgeois property. But in Russia, along with the capitalist system which is developing with feverish haste, and of the large landed property of the bourgeoisie in course of formation, more than half of the land is the common property of the peasantry. The question is, therefore, whether the Russian peasant commune, that already degenerate form of primitive commune property in land, will pass directly into the superior form of communist ownership of the land, or whether it must rather first follow the same process of dissolution that it has undergone in the historical development of the West? The only possible way to reply to that question to-day is as follows: *If the Russian Revolution is the signal for a workers' revolution in the West, and if both should be successful, then the existing communal property of Russia may serve as the starting point for a communist development.*" (Preface to 2nd Russian edition of Communist Manifesto written by Marx and Engels, 1882. Italics mine.)

If my reading and interpretation (which opposes yours) of your quotations is incorrect, how do you reconcile your quotations with mine? It seems to me you've got some job.

Yours faithfully,
HY. DIGHT.

REPLY—

Mr. Dight's method of discussing Marx in relation to Russia is so delightfully simple as to almost cause one to wonder if it is genuine. If we will only suppose that

Marx meant something quite contrary to what he wrote, then it will be easy to follow Mr. Dight. But if one decides to keep closely to what Marx wrote and taught, then Mr. Dight is hopelessly out of the argument.

Mr. Dight's "possible inference" only becomes so by straining language beyond all reason. The very quotation, "most suitable for Socialism," shows that it was "Judex" who showed a "most complete ignorance of Marx, coupled with a boundless recklessness." Lenin is not ignorant of Marx. But this only makes matters worse for Lenin.

Mr. Dight says: "Marx, of course, 'did not expect a country in a backward condition economically to establish Socialism.' But did Lenin?" The answer is Yes! Lenin proclaimed the upheaval in 1917 as a "Socialist Revolution" even as late as his "Left Wing Communism," written in 1920. It is true that later Lenin had to modify his own words, as he has had to do on so many other points. But that hits Lenin and Dight—not us.

Almost any elementary school child could answer the question about America. That country was colonised by people who had already reached the early stages of capitalism, and is an example of capitalist development by transplanted material. It is not a case of a nation passing over to capitalism without going through Feudalism, as the natives did not develop at all—perhaps because they were exterminated by the newcomers.

It is in his next sentence that Mr. Dight tries to saddle us with the simple assumption referred to above when, in dealing with the quotation from "Capital," he says: "Marx . . . clearly refers to a *revolutionary* period, etc." Marx, on the contrary, "clearly" does nothing of the sort. He was dealing with the "normal development" of societies and how they cannot evade the "successive phases" of this "normal development."

But even if one takes Mr. Dight's absurd assumption, for the purpose of the argument, Mr. Dight's conclusion is still false. When Marx writes of "revolutionary periods" he takes care to explain that he is dealing with "social revolutions," where one system is broken up and another takes its place. No such "revolution" has taken place in Russia. Due to the war and the

corruption it developed among the ruling class, Czarism collapsed, and in the chaos following, the Bolsheviks—a tiny minority—after a first failure, seized power in 1917. No fundamental change took place in the methods of producing and distributing wealth. In other words, there was no “social revolution.” All that happened was that one minority began to rule instead of another. The attempts of this minority to impose economic methods and conditions upon a people not yet developed to a level of these conditions has been without success. That is to say, that they have failed disastrously to “clear by bold leaps or remove by legal enactments” (though the latter have been turned out by the ton) “the obstacles offered by the successive phases of its normal development.” To any normal person the facts of the situation in Russia would be a complete and crushing answer to Dight. Not so to the short-sighted and intellectually limited fanatic. Calmly ignoring the situation, he tries to find comfort in idiotic interpretations of Marx’s writings.

As Mr. Dight’s first point falls, his second—dealing with the 1882 preface to the “Communist Manifesto”—no longer holds. But even apart from this, the quotation itself is a flat contradiction to the position of Mr. Dight. Take the very sentence he has put into italics because he thinks it gives us “some job.” (It does—to avoid choking with laughter at his blindness.) The sentence contains three points, each of which is in direct opposition to the position in Russia:—

“If the Russian Revolution is the signal for a workers’ revolution in the West . . . (Italics ours.)”

As the upheaval in Russia in 1917 scarcely raised a ripple among the “workers of the West,” and certainly not the faintest suggestion of a Revolution, this point by itself smashes Dight’s attempted case. At the Berlin Conference of the three “Internationals” Radek made a statement showing how correct our attitude is. He said in reference to the Soviet Republic “which no one denies is, if not a workers’, at least a revolutionary state (“Communist,” 15/4/1922). As he admits it was not a workers’ “revolution,” it would be interesting to know *whose* “revolution” he considers it to be!

The second point is:—

“and if both should be successful, etc.,”

As neither came into existence, Mr. Dight cannot draw even the pretence of support from this phrase.

“then the existing communal property of Russia may serve as the starting point for a Communist development.”

Even in the conclusion, nothing positive. Marx and Engels do not say that it “will” be a starting point, but only that it “may.” Two “ifs” and a “may” in the sentence—with the “ifs” not yet fulfilled! And this is the sort of stuff Dight relies upon when he tries to falsify the teachings of Marx. But the matter may be taken a point further.

The great blunder made by Lenin and Trotsky was that they, in their ignorance of Western conditions, expected a revolution by the workers of England, Germany, and France. Even after their first disappointment, when they had to sign the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, they still hoped for this Western Revolution. Only now are they beginning to realise the hopelessness of such an event for some time ahead. Hence their concessions and offers to the European and American capitalists.

A great deal of injury has been done to the propaganda of Socialism by attempting to foist upon Marx the responsibility for the wild-headed schemes of the Bolsheviks and their supporters. The blind praise of anything emanating from Russia has led these fanatics to actions injurious to the Bolsheviks themselves. Instead of recognising the overpowering conditions against the Bolsheviks and giving them praise for certain things they have *done*, these ranters have devoted their whole attention to boosting the absurd *claims* of the Bolsheviks. Fantastic decrees that had not the slightest effect outside of the office issuing them, were hailed as marvels produced by geniuses, that changed Russia overnight from a private property basis to one of advanced Communism. Millions of peasants who could not read were converted, we were told, into class-conscious, highly intelligent Marxians by the shoals of pamphlets distributed among them! Only its tremendous tragedy saves it from being a farce.

And all the time, as we have continually pointed out in the pages of the SOCIALIST STANDARD, the Bolsheviks were doing things that deserved high praise and which, put in their proper perspective, gave valuable

lessons to the Western workers. The first lesson they gave was to show that a minority, who were *not* capitalists, could run the affairs of a huge country, under the special conditions existing there, in an efficient manner. This lesson tends to break down the superstition still held by many workers, "that you must have the capitalists in control," and has aroused shrieking opposition from the Churchills and Poincarés of the West.

One of the Departments whose efficiency has been most loudly advertised by the supporters of Bolshevism is the War Department, whose head, Trotsky, has appropriated most of the praise to himself. But, as a matter of fact, Trotsky's work—assuming it *was* his—was far less difficult than that of every other Department. After being under Conscription for generations, the Russian peasant falls almost automatically into the position of a soldier if he is supplied with munitions. It was a task of immensely greater magnitude to manufacture a rifle in Russia than to use it once it was made. The difficulties of transport were colossal, and under the conditions prevailing the Transport Department worked in a marvellous manner. The question of obtaining food for the townspeople, and the paralysing problem of how to transport such food as existed in face of the Army's demand for railways and wagons, was sufficient to appal the strongest. In education, too, the attempt to adopt the best of Western methods, and the care given to the children will stand like a monument to the credit of those responsible for the Department.

It is for things of this kind that the Bolsheviks deserve high praise—not for ignoring the teachings of Marx. And even here the Marxian dictum receives marked illustration. What was the first obstacle the Bolsheviks met? The answer is, "Lack of sufficient men and women capable of carrying on the work." With all the good-will in the world, they were too few in numbers to "man" all the Departments themselves, and there was a lamentable shortage of others, capable of doing so, in the country. Practically every visitor to Russia, even if a bitter opponent of the Bolsheviks, agrees that the latter have been "bled white" under the terrific strain imposed upon them by the attempt to administer so huge a country.

J. F.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain

HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.